SINGLE BENCH

(2)

P.R. No. 40377-6
Presented by Shri Arun J. Chowhan
dated 22/7/06

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CHHATTISGARH

WRIT PETITION No. 3965 /2006

PETITIONER : Smt. Kalawati Lakra, w/o. Shri Jai Shankar Bhagat, aged about 30 years, R/o. Qr.No.A-2, Type III, Central Custom and Excise Colony Tikrapara, Raipur (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Principal Secretary, Department of Public Administration, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Secretary School Education department, Secretariat Raipur (C.G.).
3. Director, Public Education, Department, Directorate, Pensionbada, Raipur (C.G.).
4. State of M.P. through Principal Secretary, Department of School Education, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.).
5. Union of India, through Director, Personnel and Establishment Department, New Delhi.
6. District Education Officer, District – Raigarh (M.P.).

Clerk
[THAKUR VIJAY SINGH
Asst. Solicitor General of India
CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT
High Court Campus, Bilaspur (C.G.)

RECEIVED COPY
27/7/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

COMMISSIONER
S.R. Kaushik
BILASPUR TAHSIL AREA
27/7/06

(3)
5

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No.3965 **सन्** 2006

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	08-08-2006 Shri Rahul Jha, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Satish Gupta, Dy. Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents No.1,2,3, and 6, on advance copy. Shri S.K. Beriwal, Central Govt. counsel for respondent No.5, on advance copy. Heard. The petitioner, who is working on the post of Assistant Statistical Officer in the State of Chhattisgarh, has filed this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, with a prayer that the order Annexure-P/1 be quashed. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that inadvertently due to typographical mistake it has been mentioned in relief clause 7.2 of the petition as Annexure-P/1, in fact, the petitioner has challenged Annexure-P/8, the relieving order. The case of the petitioner is that at the time of reorganization of the State the petitioner was working as Assistant Statistical Officer at Raipur. In provisional allocation vide order dated 28.10.2000, the petitioner was allocated to the State of Chhattisgarh and thereafter, vide order dated 11.09.2002 passed for final allocation by Union of India, the petitioner was allocated to the State of Madhya Pradesh. Thereafter, the petitioner made representation for not relieving her on which the Director, Public Education recommended the case of the petitioner for allocation to the State of Chhattisgarh. However, vide order dated 30.06.2006 (Annexure-P/8) the petitioner has been relieved.	

(पीछे देखिये)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No.3965 **सन्** 2006

71

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

Mr. S.K. Beriwal, learned counsel appearing for Union of India submits that the petitioner was allocated to the State of Madhya Pradesh on the option given by the petitioner herself. But, Mr. Rahul Jha, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the year 2002, the petitioner has got married in the State of Chhattisgarh, therefore, as per the recommendation of the Director, the petitioner ought to have been allowed to continue in the State of Chhattisgarh.

In this connection, perusal of letter dated 26.06.2006 (Annexure-P/5) issued by the Secretary, General Administration Department of the State of Chhattisgarh reveals that the Central Government vide letter dated 01.05.2003 issued directions that with the consent of the States of Madhya Pradesh & Chhattisgarh, the employees can be allocated to the respective States, in pursuance of that, the State of Madhya Pradesh issued letter dated 29.04.2005 and the State of Chhattisgarh issued letter dated 28.05.2005 and it was directed that within one year adjustment of employees can be made and that period has expired on 28.04.2006. Now, looking to the difficulties of the employees and officers the said period has been extended from 29.04.2006 to 28.04.2007.

In view of the letter Annexure-P/5, the petitioner may make a representation within a period of ten days from today to respondent No.3 raising all her grievances and respondent No.3 shall examine the representation of the petitioner and forward the same with his recommendations to respondent No.1 within fifteen days from the date of its receipt, in turn, respondent No.1 shall after examining the case of the petitioner forward the same to respondent No.4 within ~~fifteen days~~ one month thereafter, who shall after examining the case of the petitioner pass final

(पीछे देखिये)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

72

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 3965 **सन्** 2006

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -3-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	order on the representation of the petitioner within another two months from the date of its receipt. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the writ petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.(W.). P. No.3085/2006 and I.A. No.7485/2006 also stand disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Soma

(पीछे देखिये)

21/11/06 14.8.06 22.9.06